

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS

California Rules of Court, rule 977(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 977(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 977.

**IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FIFTH APPELLATE DISTRICT**

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

NOE LOPEZ,

Defendant and Appellant.

F045336

(Super. Ct. No. 120265)

OPINION

THE COURT*

APPEAL from a judgment of the Superior Court of Tulare County. Melinda Reed, Judge.

Victoria H. Stafford, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and Appellant.

Bill Lockyer, Attorney General, Robert R. Anderson, Chief Assistant Attorney General, Jo Graves, Assistant Attorney General, and Charles A. French, Deputy Attorney General, for Plaintiff and Respondent.

-ooOoo-

* Before Wiseman, Acting P.J., Cornell, J., and Gomes, J.

A jury convicted appellant Noe Lopez of possession of methamphetamine (Health & Saf. Code, § 11377, subd. (a); count 1) and being under the influence of a controlled substance (Health & Saf. Code, § 11550, subd. (a); count 2). In a separate proceeding, the court found true allegations that appellant had suffered a prior felony conviction that qualified as a “strike”¹ and that he had served a prison term for that felony conviction (Pen. Code, § 667.5, subd. (b)). The court struck the prior prison term enhancement and imposed a term of four years, consisting of the two-year midterm on count 1, doubled pursuant to the three strikes law (Pen. Code, §§ 667, subd. (e)(1); 1170.12, subd. (c)(1)). The court imposed a concurrent term of 365 days on count 2, and ordered that appellant serve that term in the custody of the Tulare County Sheriff.

Appellant’s appointed appellate counsel has filed an opening brief which summarizes the pertinent facts, with citations to the record, raises no issues, and asks that this court independently review the record. (*People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436.)

Appellant, in response to this court’s invitation to submit additional briefing, has filed a supplemental brief. As best we can determine, he argues as follows: he was denied his constitutional right to effective assistance of counsel; the evidence was insufficient to support his convictions; and the police officer who arrested him “mishandle[ed]” certain evidence. We have reviewed the record, and we conclude these contentions are without merit. We have also concluded from our review of the record that no reasonably arguable legal or factual issues exist.

The judgment is affirmed.

¹ We use the term “strike” to describe a prior felony conviction that subjects a defendant to the increased punishment specified in the “three strikes” law (Pen Code, §§ 667, subds. (b)-(i); 1170.12).